

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

PRINCE CHARLES COTTEN, SR.,	:	Case No. 1:15-cv-385
Petitioner,	:	District Judge Timothy S. Black
	:	Magistrate Judge Stephanie Bowman
vs.	:	
CLERK, SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF	:	
APPEALS,	:	
Respondent.	:	

**DECISION AND ENTRY
ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE (Doc. 3)**

This civil case is before the Court pursuant to the Order of General Reference in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division to United States Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman. Pursuant to such reference, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the pleadings filed with this Court and, on June 26, 2015, submitted a Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 3). Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on July 9, 2015. (Doc. 4).¹

¹ Petitioner fails to provide “*specific* written objections” to the Report and Recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2) (emphasis added). “The filing of objections provides the district court with the opportunity to consider the *specific* contentions of the parties and to correct any errors immediately.” *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 950 (6th Cir. 1981) (emphasis added). However, “[t]he filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object.” *Cole v. Yukins*, 7 F. App’x 354, 356 (6th Cir. 2001). Here, while Petitioner argues that the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations are “contrary to law,” he fails to make any relevant argument in support of this assertion. (Doc. 4). Indeed, beyond positing, without basis, the opposite of the Magistrate Judge’s findings, Petitioner fails entirely to address the issue of jurisdiction. (*Id.*) Rather, in support of his general disagreement with the recommendation, Petitioner merely reiterates the allegations set forth in his petition. (*Id.*) The Court finds the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations thorough and accurate, and, accordingly, **Petitioner’s objections are overruled**.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered *de novo* all of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing, the Court determines that such Report and Recommendation (Doc. 3) should be, and is hereby, adopted in its entirety. Accordingly:

1. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 3) is **ADOPTED**;
2. Petitioner's petition for a writ of mandamus (Doc. 2) is **DENIED**;
3. This case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice, and **the Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly**, whereupon this case shall be **TERMINATED** on the docket of this Court; and
4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), the Court certifies that an appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith and, therefore, this Court **DENIES** Petitioner leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 8/12/15

s/ Timothy S. Black
Timothy S. Black
United States District Judge